1999	—	20
2000	—	22
2001	—	44

(b) and (c) Suspension from service is resorted to for stopping an officer from influencing the outcome of an inquiry. As such, suspension is not regarded as a penalty. On a review, whenever the Disciplinary Authority is satisfied that the apprehension of tampering with evidence no longer exists, the suspension is revoked but the inquiry/investigation/trial continues, uninterrupted. The Disciplinary Authority of the respective administrative Ministry/Department has to decide the issue of reinstatement of an officer placed under suspension. Such figures are not centrally maintained.

Violation of rules by inquiry officer

1004. SHRI GAYA SINGH: Will the PRIME MINISTER be pleased to refer to the answer to Unstarred Question 1726 given in the Rajya Sabha on the 1st August, 2002 and state the details of the action, if any, prescribed for dealing with the erring inquiry officers who violate the relevant existing instructions in this regard and do not stay the proceedings?

THE MINISTER OF STATE IN THE MINISTRY OF PERSONNEL, PUBLIC GRIEVANCES AND PENSIONS (SHRIMATI VASUNDHARA RAJE): It has been stated in answer to part (c) of Rajya Sabha Unstarred Question No. 1727 dated 1st August, 2002 that the employee concerned can raise the question of non-observance of instructions for staying the proceedings in his submission to the disciplinary authority or appellate authority or before the Court of Law, if he so desires. Any Government servant who violates the laid down rules and instructions can be considered as indulging in an unbecoming act and the disciplinary authority concerned can take appropriate action against the erring inquiry officer wherever considered necessary.

Non technical bureaucrats in technical departments

1005. SHRI RAJKUMAR DHOOT: Will the PRIME MINISTER be pleased to state:

(a) whether it is a fact that the various technical Ministries/ Departments are headed by non-technical bureaucrats;